

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 4, 8-11, 59 and 63-66 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections and if written to include intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten these claims in independent form to the extent necessary as new claims as indicated. Applicants have written claims 4, 8, 9, 59, 63 and 64 in independent form and as such, these claims are allowable.

The office action includes an election/restriction requirement. It is stated that claims 14-33, 36-54 and 69-88 read on Species II. Therefore, the Examiner has withdrawn these claims from consideration. As such, Applicants elect the remaining claims. The office action indicates that claims 4, 8-11, 59 and 63-66 are generic claims and contain allowable subject matter.

It is also stated that at least claims 1-12, 34, 35 and 56-67 are generic. In view of the identified generic claims, and the withdrawn claims of Species II, Applicants elect Species I that includes claims 13, 55 and 68. These claims have also been examined. As such, Applicants withdraw Species II, which are claims 14-33, 36-54 and 69-88.

Claims 8 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended the claim to be consistent with the Specification on page 18 indicating that determining whether a tile is suitable for partial compression includes determining whether said tile is covered by no more than two triangle primitives. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 8 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite due to the same language given for the reasons for non-enablement.

Applicants have amended the claim to be consistent with, for example, that described in page 18. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-13, 34-45, 55-58, 60-62 and 67-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Molnar et al. Independent claims 1, 34 and 56 have been amended to include, for example, limitations of claims 7 or 62. The amended independent claims include, among other limitations, that evaluation takes place to determine in addition to full compression, partial compression and designating a tile for partial compression if it is deemed to be suitable for partial compression. The office action cites column 7, lines 45-55 as allegedly teaching this subject matter. However, as noted in the paragraph above the cited portion, Molnar does not perform partial compression nor does he designate a tile for partial compression since no partial compression is performed. Instead, “only fully reduced tile can be compressed.” (column 7, lines 45 and 46). If a tile is not fully reduced, then all reduced fragments are replicated into their expanded form. The expanded tiles are then stored in frame buffer memory. (See column 7, lines 40-47). As such, Molnar teaches that only a full compression is done (full reduction meaning that all of the colors are the same in a tile), otherwise no compression is performed for a tile. There is no teaching of full compression and partial compression as Applicants’ claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For example, claim 6 requires that full compression compresses a pixel into one word per pixel. The office action cites column 10, lines 20-35 alleging that 64 bits per 4 pixels is one, 16 bit word per pixel. However, the cited portion refers to 8 pixels and does not appear to make any mention of a one word per pixel compression. Accordingly, the reference does not teach what is alleged and the claim is in condition for allowance. Other differences will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 13, 2007

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005